



Norman H. Bangerter
Governor
Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

DOGM
MINERALS PROGRAM
FILE COPY

September 14, 1990

TO: Mineral File

FROM: Holland Shepherd, Reclamation Specialist *HHS*

RE: Site Inspection, Georgia Pacific Quarries, Georgia Pacific Corporation,
M/041/009, Sevier County, Utah

Date of Inspection: September 10, 1990

Time of Inspection: 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Attendees: Mr. Bob Shajary, Mr. Brent Bastian, Georgia Pacific Corporation; Michael Jackson, and Linda Jackson, Bureau of Land Management; Holland Shepherd, DOGM

This inspection was conducted to evaluate mining impacts and mining reclamation. The site has not been inspected in its entirety by this Division, in probably the last 2 - 2 1/2 years. An inspection was made of a proposed landfill on the Georgia Pacific site last month. This inspection was also a follow-up to that inspection.

Mr. Bob Shajary is the new plant superintendent of the Georgia Pacific site. He has replaced Mr. Dave Corkill who retired from Georgia Pacific last month.

The Georgia Pacific site consists of several areas of disturbance including several quarries. The operator mines over an extensive area, and is mining several different quarries within this area as a means of blending the gypsum ore to gain the best quality product for the manufacture of wallboard. We visited several reclaimed areas at the site, as well as active mining areas.

The first reclaimed area was on a portion of the Western Claims Southern Area, T23S, R1W, Section 5. The area was regraded and reseeded in the fall of 1988. Very poor plant growth is present on the area. This is no doubt due to the droughty conditions that this area has been experiencing over the last 2 - 3 years. This is also no

doubt, due to the time of the year that the inspection was conducted. At this time of year, most plants have already gone through their life cycle. Also, this has been an extremely dry year, unlike others in the past. The vegetation on the site consists mostly of weedy species such as halogeton and russian thistle. Even these species are very sparse. Some remnants of the initial seed mix remain, indian ricegrass is present as well as crested wheatgrass and some sweetclover. This area has no topsoil to speak of. The area was regraded using overburden or waste material which is now the planting medium. This material is very shaley and very coarse. Because of its poor or porous physical characteristics, it presents a problem to plant growth in that it does not allow for adequate moisture retention in the soil. In areas where this material has weathered or degraded, it has become less coarse over time, providing a better plant growth medium.

We looked at a second reclaimed area at the northern end of the mining site. The location is Western Claims Northern Area, T22S, R1W, Section 21. Here again, the same conditions exist. The area has been planted, but very little plant success is evident on the site. Mr. Bastian and I discussed the idea of allowing a site such as this to sit after regrading has occurred for 2 - 3 years, allowing for weathering of the material before seeding is done. This would allow for breakdown of this material so that it's physical nature is less coarse, and be more conducive to plant growth after perhaps 2 - 3 years of weathering. It is a shaley material so weathers rather rapidly and provides a better texture, less coarse, more powdery for plant growth over time.

The operator has several active areas currently active. They are located in the Crescent Claims and Kings Meadow Claims. The active areas are located on patented property as well as BLM properties.

We looked at the proposed landfill area, actually not so much proposed because it has been active already for probably over one year, as well as another landfill area located in the Crescent Claims area. This landfill is smaller than the one that the operator has already asked to amend into the plan. However, it is located poorly. The landfill is located at the head of a dry wash or drainage. Material is being dumped down into the drainage itself. The problem with this type of siting is that during a large event rainstorm, much of this loose, waste wallboard material would be washed down into the drainages on site and potentially into the Sevier River, itself. Since this landfill has already been established, it is debatable at this time whether to ask the operator to relocate it; however, this is something that can be discussed with the Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Wastes.

Page 3
Georgia Pacific Corp.
M/041/009
September 14, 1990

Both of these landfills are located in areas that are quite dry, very little association with active bodies of water. The only problems that could be associated with these sites would be dust from blowing waste rock and also debris from blowing paper and trash associated with this waste dumping. Also, the operator has located these dumps in relatively steep areas of topography. The material is being dumped down into, and over the side of small swells into dry swales below. These swales gravitate into dry washes that continue on down towards the Sevier River drainage. It would take a large rainstorm event to wash any of this material all the way to the Sevier River.

I gave a copy to Mr. Shajary of a letter that I had written in 1989 asking that Georgia Pacific update their Reclamation Contract and Self Bonding Agreement. Mr. Shajary said that he would take care of that outstanding issue as soon as he could.

Georgia Pacific's millsite also has some surrounding waste dumps created from waste or wallboard waste. These dumps are obviously quite old and probably no longer active. The operator is using the dumps up in the quarry areas now rather than dumps associated with the mill site. Mr. Shajary could not tell me if the waste dumping area, associated with the mill site, was permitted with any state or federal regulatory agency. This area is not, at this time, a part of the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining permit with Georgia Pacific.

A letter should be sent to the operator and the Bureau of Land Management addressing approval for the amended landfill at the Georgia Pacific site. At this time, we do not have a formalized approval from the Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Wastes, but that is something that may be forthcoming. Apparently the BLM is satisfied with the way the operator has addressed this question at this particular site. However, Michael Jackson, of the BLM, did express some concern about the amount of trash and debris that was getting into the waste material at the landfill associated with BLM lands. The BLM is not involved in the other landfill site because it is not on BLM property. The operator only has permission to dump certain types of material at this site and it does not include garbage or debris such as tires or old furniture, wood products, etc. There was some evidence of non Georgia Pacific trash at the site in other words locals have been coming up and dumping pickup loads of garbage at this particular landfill without permission of the operator.

The operator hopes to eventually reduce substantially, the amount of waste material generated by the plant by recycling it. Apparently, the recycling process has not been implemented yet, but will be in the very near future. This type of

Page 4
Georgia Pacific Corp.
M/041/009
September 14, 1990

recycling process has proven to be very effective at other sites in the past, and will no doubt, be incorporated and work well at the Georgia Pacific site. According to Bob Shajary, up to 96 - 97 percent of the waste wallboard can be recycled in the process if done properly.

jb
cc: Bob Shajary, Georgia Pacific
Michael Jackson, Sevier River Area, BLM
Wayne Hedberg, DOGM
MNM041009.1